

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/050,618	01/16/2002	Michael Miravet Sorribes	81421-4006	6451	
28765 7	590 06/09/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 1700 K STREET, N.W.			BROWN, M	BROWN, MICHAEL A	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3764	-	
			DATE MAILED: 06/09/200	DATE MAILED: 06/09/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/050,618	SORRIBES, MICHAEL MIRAVET			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Michael Brown	3764			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of third d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05</u>	November 2004.				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ Th	nis action is non-final.	·			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 12,13 and 17-31 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 12 and 13 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 17-25 and 28-31 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 26 and 27 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11-42-04. 	Paper No(s	nummary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/050,618

Art Unit: 3764

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 17-18, 20-23, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Coffey.

Coffey discloses in figures 1-2 a non-invasive device for correcting a deformation in a human external ear comprising a fixture (the entire device shown in figure 1), a first adhesive 18, two separate parts (10, 12), stuck together with a second adhesive 16, the fixture includes a double coated tape (10 is coated with an adhesive on both sides), textile material (cloth) and a detachable film.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coffey in view of Dubrowski '838.

Coffey discloses in figures 1-2 a non-invasive device, substantially as claimed. However, Coffey does not disclose the permanently deformable material being metal.

Dubrowski teaches in figure 1 a non-invasive device for correcting a deformation in a human external ear comprising a fixture made of metal. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made that the permanently deformable material disclosed by Coffey could be made of metal as taught by Dubrowki because metal can be permanently deformed and it is durable.

Claims 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coffey '262 in view of Godley, as set forth in the rejection of claim 10 in the previous office action. Note: Dubrowski teaches the method of folding a non-invasively device around an ear. The device has a permanently deformed portion.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 26-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 12-13 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 5, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Coffee discloses a pair of pads that are not folded together. However, Applicant does not positively recite in claim 17 that the two parts are folded. Applicant merely recites that when the two parts are folded together. Applicant argues that claim 17 recites a means for adhering the device positioning the device to the ear. However, it is not clear as to what the means for adhering is in reference to. The examiner is interpreting the means for adhering to be

Art Unit: 3764

the adhesive. Where the device is adapted to be attached to the body was not given patentable weight. Applicant argues that Dubrowski does not anticipate the device. However, Dubrowski was used as a modifier to make the deformable material of metal. Applicant argues that Godley doesn't anticipate the invention. However, Godley was used as a modifier to make the textile material of gauze. Applicant argues that method claim is patentable for the same reason as the allowed claims. However, Dubrowski was used as a modifier to put two members onto the ear. One member is on the inside of the ear and the other side is on the outside of the ear.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Brown whose telephone number is 571-272-4972. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30 am-4:00 pm Monday-Thursday.

Application/Control Number: 10/050,618 Page 5

Art Unit: 3764

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gergory Huson can be reached on 571-272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Brown April 21, 2005

MICHAEL A. BROWN PRIMARY EXAMINER